VOL 11 No 3 MARCH 1981

SURVEY of Current Affairs

Government and Administration

Engagement of the Prince of Wales 63
New Parliamentary Grouping 63
Northern Ireland 64

External Affairs and Defence

Prime Minister's Visit to the United States 65
Africa and the West 67
Britain's Nuclear Deterrent 69
Shorter Note 71
Iran

Economic and Scientific Affairs

The Budget 1981-82: a Summary 72
Employment and Training Bill 73
Atomic Energy (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill 74
Steel Industry 74
Shorter Notes 76
Industry Bill Amendments; Small Firms' Incorporation; Inner Cities Policy; Railway Electrification

Social and Cultural Affairs

Britain and the Year of Disabled People 78
Education of Handicapped Children 79
Indecent Displays (Control) Bill 80
Shorter Notes 81
Race Relations; Health and Personal Services; 'Open Channel' Radio

Documentation 82

Published for British Information Services by
Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London
Annual subscription including postage and index £18.60

The *Survey of Current Affairs* is produced for British Information Services overseas, but in response to requests has also been made available in Britain. Subscription and distribution inquiries should be addressed to Her Majesty's Stationery Office, P.O. Box 569, London SE1 9NH, and editorial inquiries to Reference Division, Central Office of Information, Hercules Road, Westminster Bridge Road, London SE1 7DU. Although the material is Crown Copyright, it may be reproduced without special permission.
Other documents produced by Reference Division if not on sale through Her Majesty's Stationery Office, may be obtained direct from Reference Division on payment of a small charge.

GOVERNMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

Engagement of the Prince of Wales

The engagement of the Prince of Wales has been announced.

It was announced on 24 February that the Prince of Wales is to marry the Lady Diana Spencer. The wedding will take place at St Paul's Cathedral on Wednesday 29 July and the day will be a public holiday throughout Britain.

Lady Diana is the first Englishwoman to marry an heir to the throne for over 300 years. She was born on 1 July 1961 and is the daughter of the eighth Earl Spencer, a former equerry to the late King George VI and to the Queen. Her mother, the Hon Mrs Shand-Kydd (whose marriage to Lord Spencer was dissolved in 1969), is the daughter of the late Lord Fermoy, and her grandmother Ruth, Lady Fermoy, is a Lady-in-Waiting to Queen Elizabeth the Queen Mother.

Lady Diana was educated at West Heath school near Sevenoaks in Kent, and at a finishing school in Switzerland. She has lived in London since 1978 and has taught at a kindergarten in Pimlico.

New Parliamentary Grouping

Details of a new parliamentary grouping, composed of 12 former Labour MPs, and the present state of the parties in the House of Commons are given below.

Twelve members of Parliament have resigned from the Labour Party and formed a parliamentary group representing the Council for Social Democracy, an independent organisation set up to rally support for the establishment of a new parliamentary party. The 12 MPs will now sit in the House of Commons as 'social democrats' and have declared their intention of working to develop a social democratic manifesto. The MPs and the 11 Liberal Party MPs have formed a joint consultative committee to co-ordinate their parliamentary actions.

The Council for Social Democracy, which has announced its intention of establishing a new political party before Easter, was set up in January by four former Labour ministers as a result of their disagreement with the party's approach to a number of issues and procedures, including nuclear disarmament, the European Community, and the new arrangements for electing the leader of the party.[1] The objectives of the Council are set out in a declaration made on 25 January and published in an advertisement in *The Guardian* newspaper on 5 February.

Among the 12 MPs are Dr David Owen, Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs from 1977 to 1979, the chairman of the parliamentary group, and Mr William Rodgers, Secretary of State for Transport from 1976 to 1979. In addition to Dr Owen and Mr Rodgers, the founder members of the Council for Social Democracy are Mrs Shirley Williams and Mr Roy Jenkins, both former Cabinet ministers in past Labour governments. Mr Jenkins was President of the Commission of the European Community from 1977 until January of this year. Neither he nor Mrs Williams is an MP at present. The four form the collective leadership of the Council.

State of the Parties

The state of the parties in the House of Commons is now as follows:

Conservative	337
Labour	255
Group representing the Council for Social Democracy	12
Liberal	11
Scottish National	2
Plaid Cymru (Welsh Nationalist)	2
Official Unionist (Northern Ireland)	5
Democratic Unionist (Northern Ireland)	3
United Ulster (Northern Ireland)	1
Ulster Progressive Unionist (Northern Ireland)	1
Independent Socialist (Northern Ireland)	1
Vacant	1
TOTAL	631

The four remaining seats are held by the Speaker of the House of Commons and his three deputies who do not vote except in their official capacity in the event of a tie. The Government majority over all other parties is 43.

[1]Following the decision at the annual party conference in October 1980 to change the procedure for electing the leader of the party (see p 311, 1980), it was agreed at a special party conference in January that in future the leader would be elected annually by a college consisting of representation from the Parliamentary Party, the constituency parties, and the affiliated organisations in ratios of 30:30:40 respectively.

The vacant seat arises from the death on 5 March of the Independent MP for Fermanagh and South Tyrone.

In the House of Lords a number of peers, including several former ministers, have declared their support for the Council for Social Democracy.

Northern Ireland

The constitutional position of Northern Ireland as part of the United Kingdom, and the Government's determination to stamp out terrorism, were discussed by the Prime Minister in a speech in Belfast. Prisoners at the Maze and Armagh prisons are ending their 'dirty protest'.

Prime Minister's Speech

In a speech in Belfast on 5 March during a two-day visit to Northern Ireland the Prime Minister, Mrs Margaret Thatcher, said that the Government had repeatedly declared that Northern Ireland would remain part of the United Kingdom until its people and the Parliament at Westminster decided otherwise. That was the law of the land, enshrined in the Northern Ireland Constitution Act 1973, and was fundamental to the Government's thinking. Mrs Thatcher emphasised that there was no 'sell-out'. Those who argued otherwise had simply got it wrong or were choosing not to understand the purpose of her discussions with the Prime Minister of the Irish Republic, Mr Charles Haughey (see pp 356-7, 1980).

'We all have a common interest in peace and reconciliation', said Mrs Thatcher. 'We all have a common interest in creating a society where the gunman has no place and where he will no longer be able to kill and maim innocent people, and we all have a common interest in building better working relationships within these islands and within Europe.'

Security

The Government's first priority was to protect the people of Northern Ireland from the bullet and the bomb. The fight against terrorism had advanced a long way and great strides had been made in getting back to normal policing.

The Government's aim was to build a healthy and harmonious society in Northern Ireland. The measures the Government took to deal with the terrorist minority must do nothing to damage the fabric of society. The police and army fully accepted their duty to operate solely within the law and to act in a way which won the support of the whole community. More and more were they getting that support. The security forces needed too—and increasingly were getting—determined and effective co-operation from the authorities in the Irish Republic.

The terrorists would carry their determination to disrupt society to any lengths. Once again there was a hunger strike at the Maze prison in the quest for what they called political status (see below). There was no such thing as political murder, political bombing or political violence. There was only criminal murder, criminal bombing and criminal violence. The Government would not compromise on this. There would be no political status.

Those convicted of serious crimes and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment should serve their sentences in humane conditions. The Government would continue to maintain and, if possible to improve, the high standards which Northern Ireland prisons already provided.

The people of Northern Ireland were entitled to a future as secure and hopeful as that of any other part of the United Kingdom. To that end, the Government would support the security forces and would persevere until terrorism had been stamped out.

End of 'Dirty Protest'

The intention of the prisoners who have been taking part in the so-called dirty protest – 411 men at Maze and 28 women at Armagh – to stop fouling their cells was announced by the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, Mr Humphrey Atkins, in the House of Commons on 3 March (*Hansard*, Vol 1,000, No 59, cols 131-4). Mr Atkins said that 240 prisoners had already been moved into clean cells and the rest would be moved as soon as possible.

The Government welcomed the decision by the prisoners to put an end to the degrading conditions that they had imposed upon themselves. They had indicated, however, that their action was being taken in support of demands for changes in the prison regime which would give effect to their demand for political status. In that respect they differed from the 80 prisoners who had stopped protesting altogether after the hunger strike ended on 18 December (see p 4). That group were now receiving the full range of privileges and facilities introduced in December, including that of association and of wearing their own leisure clothes of an approved type in the evenings and at weekends. That regime remained available for all who chose to take advantage of it.

Mr Atkins opened his statement by saying that on 1 March one prisoner at Maze refused food and declared himself to be on hunger strike, action that was said to be in support of the prisoners' demand for political status.

The claim for political status had been rejected by the European Commission of Human Rights, by successive Governments and by both sides of the House, said Mr Atkins. He wished to repeat that the Government would not give way on the issue of political status under pressure of further protest action, whatever form it took and whether inside or outside the prisons.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND DEFENCE

Prime Minister's Visit to the United States

The need to prevent Soviet encroachment in the Gulf and South-West Asia and Western approaches to problems in the Middle East, Southern Africa and El Salvador were among the subjects discussed during the Prime Minister's visit to the United States in February.

The Prime Minister, Mrs Margaret Thatcher, accompanied by the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Lord Carrington, visited the United States from 25 to 28 February for discussions with President Reagan and other members of the new United States Government. In addition, at a dinner in New York Mrs Thatcher spoke of the importance of defending freedom in the modern world. The dinner was arranged by veterans of the Office of Strategic Services (the precursor of the Central Intelligence Agency) who presented Mrs Thatcher with the Donovan Award. This, named after Major-General William J. Donovan, the first leader of the Office, is awarded to people who have rendered distinguished service in the interests of democracy and the cause of freedom.

DISCUSSIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

Reporting on her visit in a statement to the House of Commons on 2 March (*Hansard*, Vol 1,000, No 58, cols 19-27), Mrs Thatcher said that her 'warm and generous' reception in Washington testified 'to the health of the Anglo-American relationship and also to the excellent understanding which the President and I had established even before either of us assumed our present responsibilities'. The talks, which had covered all the most important aspects of the international scene, had been particularly timely since the new administration was still formulating its policy on the issues raised. At this early stage, however, there had, of course, been no question of new commitments being entered into by either side.

In discussions on East-West relations, Mrs Thatcher continued, both sides had agreed that the recent speech by President Brezhnev of the Soviet Union had contained, besides much that was unacceptable, certain points which needed to be explained and explored. This was especially so with regard to his remarks about arms control,[1] which both she and President Reagan saw as a necessary complement to defence and deterrence. On the Middle East, Mrs Thatcher said that, in explaining the objectives of the recent European initiative (see pp 349-50, 1980), she had pointed out that this was intended not to compete with United Stated efforts, but to complement them; while on Southern Africa both sides had agreed to keep closely in touch, particularly in relation to Namibia, a problem to which the United Nations was increasingly turning its attention. As for El Salvador, on which the United States had expressed its concern about the developing conflict and its opposition to the support which the guerrilla movement was receiving from external sources, the Prime Minister said that she had indicated that the British Government shared the United States view of outside interference in that country, that it condemned violence from whatever quarter it came, and that it considered that the people of El Salvador should be able to determine their own future peacefully and democratically.[2]

The threat to the stability and security of the Gulf and South-West Asia following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan (see pp 355-6, 1980) had also been discussed, Mrs Thatcher said, and she had pointed out that Britain shared the determination of the United States, and of its other Allies, to prevent Soviet encroachment in this region. She had added that, if a rapid deployment force were to be created, for use, if necessary, in an emergency in this or other areas, Britain would be ready to contribute to it in the same way as, in conjunction with the United States and France, it had already stationed naval units in the Gulf in response to the situation arising from the Iran-Iraq war.

[1]Addressing the twenty-sixth congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on 23 February, President Brezhnev spoke of the Soviet Union's readiness to continue negotiations on strategic nuclear, theatre nuclear and conventional arms control and to extend the area covered by military confidence-building measures to include the entire European part of the Soviet Union. He also proposed the introduction of such measures in the Far East.

[2]Citing evidence of external military support for left-wing guerrillas fighting the El Salvador Government of President Napoleon Duarte, the United States has increased its military aid to that Government since January. On 23 February, the US Government released documents which, it claimed, presented 'evidence of clandestine military support given by the Soviet Union, Cuba and other Communist allies' to the guerrillas.

In talks with the US Secretary of State for Defence, Mr Caspar Weinberger, Mrs Thatcher said that she had pointed out that Britain's defence expenditure in the last two years had increased in accordance with the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation's target (see p 344, 1980). For his part, Mr Weinberger had agreed that there should be a better balance in defence purchases between the two countries. This would lead to a more effective use of the Alliance's resources.

Finally, Mrs Thatcher said that the United States Government had expressed its intention to consult even more closely and frequently with its Allies than in the past. She welcomed this and hoped that her visit had contributed to deepening the understanding on which such consultation had always to be based.

THE DEFENCE OF FREEDOM

Freedom based on respect for the individual, Mrs Thatcher told her New York audience, was 'the great gift of Western culture to mankind', the 'driving force of the Western democracies today', and 'the source of their strength, of their diversity and of their prosperity'. It was also 'the most contagious of ideas and the one most destructive of tyranny', which was why tyrants of every kind had fought, and still fought, so hard to destroy it. However, Mrs Thatcher continued: 'They will always fail, because where freedom is the heritage of centuries as in [the United States and Britain] it is tenaciously defended; and because where it is newly established, it inspires confidence and hope. Nowhere and never has it been consciously surrendered: we have just seen that confirmed, happily, in Spain where a constitutional monarch has played such a remarkable role.[1]

The Threat to Freedom

Freedom, however, like much else that was worthwhile, was under threat. Some threats were as old as human society itself – extremism and fanaticism; the pursuit of power for its own sake; the aggressiveness that was sometimes the mask for a deep sense of insecurity. Others were born of present troubles – poverty and hunger, wars and refugees – all of which contributed to 'a pervasive and destructive atmosphere of uncertainty', the effects of which, in a shrinking world, no one could altogether escape. Today, however, there was also a phenomenon of a different kind—'a group of states whose leaders believe, or profess to believe, that history has predetermined them and us to a relationship of struggle, and pre-ordained that they and not we should be the winners'.

This 'new creed of struggle', Mrs Thatcher explained, was backed by the old tools of pressure. The Soviet Union spent about one-sixth of its national wealth on military purposes. In 1980, for example, it had manufactured 1,600 combat aircraft, 3,000 tanks and some 1,500 intercontinental or intermediate range missiles, most of which would simply join 'the already gigantic Soviet arsenal on land and sea and in the air'. This did not mean, Mrs Thatcher believed, that the Soviet Government was contemplating direct aggression against the West, but there were other motives. Firstly, it was seeking reassurance for its own fears, for like many whose consciences were uneasy, it found it hard to believe that others did not conspire as it did. Secondly, it hoped that knowledge of its sheer might would be enough to split Europe and Japan from the United States; the Soviet leadership calculated 'that a collapse of will in Western Europe would leave them free to determine its fate, and perhaps that of the world, without recourse to war'. Thirdly, it wanted to gain influence outside Europe with the aim of out-flanking the West through the South.

The expansion of Soviet military power, therefore, had been accompanied by repeated attempts to increase Soviet influence in the Third World, by subversion and by active intervention – directly or through proxies. In Angola, in Somalia and in Ethiopia the Soviet Union or Cuba had intervened by force in conflicts thousands of miles from their borders. In South-East Asia Soviet weapons, training and money had enabled Vietnam to impose its will on both Laos and Cambodia (see pp 316-17, 1980). In Afghanistan the Soviet Union had marched in and rescued a regime tottering under the weight of its own unpopularity, and that 'Anschluss' was now maintained only by the guns of 80,000 Soviet troops (see pp 355-6, 1980). Finally, in the Caribbean, Cuba was continually trying to export a Marxist system which in that unhappy island itself had had the most catastrophic consequences. The latest target for its activities was El Salvador. Mrs Thatcher agreed with President Reagan that Cuban interference in, and arms supplies to, that country were totally unacceptable.

In short, Mrs Thatcher said, the danger was 'an unstable world harbouring a super power with a destructive ideology and an expansionist record'. This danger, however, should not be exaggerated, but measured dispassionately. The Soviet Union had suffered setbacks. For all its efforts, it had made no advances in Europe since 1945, and recent events in Poland had demonstrated the failure of the Soviet system to take root in Eastern Europe. It had been thrown out of Egypt and been unable to re-establish itself in any other Middle-Eastern state, while its relations with the People's Republic of China were deeply hostile. At the United Nations, 111 nations had condemned the invasion of Afghanistan and called for a complete Soviet withdrawal. This vote suggested that, while the Soviet Union might have a handful of clients, it had few friends or admirers. This was not surprising since the Soviet system did not produce material prosperity and denied spiritual satisfaction. Mrs Thatcher continued: 'After an uninterrupted monopoly of absolute power lasting 63 years the controlled society has failed. The economy is run on strange principles: from each according to his own instructions, to each according to his party status. The rules of the political system are equally simple: for the few, privilege; for the many, the part of a studio audience clapping for the cameras.'

[1]During an attempted coup by military and police elements in Spain on 23 and 24 February, King Juan Carlos broadcast to the nation his determination to uphold the constitution.

The West's Response

Recognising this, the West should set about the defence of its liberties with confidence. There were economic, social and political problems at home and abroad, but who in the West would exchange its problems for those of the Soviet Union? 'History is not moving, inevitably or otherwise, in favour of Marxism-Leninism', she added. 'Its disciples know that their ideas run counter to the deepest and strongest instincts of men. They are destined, sooner or later, to fail.'

In this situation, the West had firstly to resolve to avert the danger presented by Soviet ambitions and Soviet military power. Firmness and determination had to be the order of the day. Secondly, the free nations of the world had to work together as never before. This did not mean that they had to agree on everything. Viewpoints would differ, but this reflected the liberty which the West sought to defend. Such differences did not undermine the case for co-operation, but merely underscored the need to concert policies. The interests the Western nations had in common by far transcended any differences between them.

Détente

The translation of the West's common purpose into practical policies, Mrs Thatcher stated, demanded a clear understanding of its objectives and how they were to be achieved. The Soviet Union had in practice interpreted détente as the pursuit of struggle by all means short of war. It had to be brought home to the Soviet leaders that the West was ready to live alongside them but not to be the passive target of their activities. The supreme task of modern statesmanship was prevention of war. Therefore, the West sought détente, but it had to be genuine, two-way détente based on the recognition of the longing of all peoples for stability, for independence, for freedom.

It was necessary to continue dealing with the Soviet Union, and to do so with realism and consistency. Referring to President Brezhnev's speech of 23 February, Mrs Thatcher said that, while there was much in it which had to be utterly rejected, there were also things which needed to be explained and explored and turned, if possible, to the benefit of the world. In particular, there were signs of a Soviet readiness to negotiate, and she welcomed this. In this perilous world, negotiation between governments had to continue, particularly in the field of arms control – or better still of arms reduction. It was necessary to establish a military balance between East and West and to ensure that that balance held.

Defence

The necessary condition of such negotiations, as for every aspect of East-West relations, was that the West should be strong. President Reagan's recognition of the need to prevent the Soviet Union from outdistancing the West militarily was recognised in Europe too. The security of Europe was indivisible from that of North America. Both were pillars of the North Atlantic Alliance which was one of the enduring achievements of modern history. Under a resurgent United States leadership that Alliance would be revitalised and strengthened.

The interests of the Allies did not stop at the boundaries of the Alliance, Mrs Thatcher added. There was an urgent need for a new defence policy beyond the North Atlantic. Soviet encroachment in regions vital to the interests of the members of the Alliance and to the economies of the world had to be prevented. This was true of parts of Africa; it was true of the Gulf. She welcomed President Reagan's determination to tackle this problem without delay, and said that, as a loyal ally, Britain would help to the very maximum of its ability.

The Developing World

The Third World too had to make choices. The West and the Soviet Union offered the example of their systems – the free or the unfree. For its part, the West did not demand alignment or displays of fidelity. Its ambition was that Third World countries should be at liberty to solve their own problems in their own way. It was confident that left to themselves most would choose to live in freedom in a free society. It was also happy that Western and Third World countries should exchange resources, human and material, where the exchange benefited both. If, having assessed the dangers, the developing nations took steps to defend themselves, alone or in regional groups, the West would be ready to respond.

Conclusion

While it had been long recognised that the 1980s would be a difficult and dangerous decade, Mrs Thatcher believed that events were beginning to move in the West's favour. She continued: 'The developing world is recognising the realities of Soviet ambitions and of Soviet life. There is new determination in the Western Alliance. There is new leadership in America, which gives confidence and hope to all in the free world. I pledge my country to work with the United States in a new and greater effort to promote stability, to prevent aggression and to oppose tyranny. I call on free peoples everywhere to join with us. Our way, the way of freedom, will prevail. It will prevail because we are determined that it shall.'

Africa and the West

Relations between Africa and the West, with particular reference to Zimbabwe, Southern Africa, and the Soviet Union's involvement in Africa, were discussed by the Lord President of the Council, Lord Soames, in a speech to the European Atlantic Group in London on 23 February.

In his introductory remarks Lord Soames stressed the importance of Africa to Britain and the West. British trade with, and investments in, black Africa, especially Nigeria, were 'much more

important' than those in South Africa, though these remained large. In addition, there were still over 100,000 British expatriates living and working in Commonwealth states in Africa. Africa's strategic situation, placed directly to the south of Europe and commanding so many of the West's trade routes was also of considerable importance. It was no wonder that the Soviet Union, 'faced with the impossibility of making progress in Europe against the bulwark of NATO', was casting 'ambitious looks at the continent of Africa'. The spread of Soviet influence there signified a grave setback for Western interests.

Africa and the Eastern Bloc

The process of decolonisation in Africa had gone more smoothly than many had feared, Lord Soames said, but there had been an inevitable reaction to the colonial period. The new states found that independence did not bring all the freedoms expected and that they were subject to economic constraints and shortage of resources. Their leaders found the problems of government real and severe and their actions inhibited by the pressure of international events. These difficulties had been blamed on the former colonial powers who were accused of doing too little to help their former colonies, yet, at the same time, many forms of Western involvement were attacked as neo-colonialism.

This period of anti-imperialist reaction had naturally lent itself to Soviet interests. The language of Marxism-Leninism, with its talk of imperialism and its overthrow, and the Soviet support for liberation movements, had given the Africans a false impression that the Soviet Union was their natural ally. After earlier Soviet involvement in Egypt, Guinea, Mali and Somalia, the Angolan civil war and the overthrow of the Emperor of Ethiopia had given the Soviet Union the chance of direct involvement and control through the introduction of Cuban troops (see pp 119-20, 1978). The struggles for liberation in Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) and Namibia had also offered 'the prospect of expanding Soviet influence through support of liberation movements'.

As the Europeans withdrew, however, it became harder for the Soviet Union to explain why it should take their place. It had no natural affinity with Africa, no common language, and different judicial, education and other systems. Many Africans, Lord Soames said, were coming to realise that the Soviet Union had 'little to offer in material terms – only arms and an unwelcome degree of political control'. By its invasion and occupation of Afghanistan (see pp 15-18, 1980) it had revealed itself in its true colours. In some quarters there was even a growing resentment fuelled by blatantly one-sided arrangements like those whereby the Soviet Union systematically deprived the Africans of much of their fish. Africans, particularly those who had experienced the presence of the Soviet Union and its missions, were beginning to realise that what it offered was largely irrelevant to Africa's real needs: 'Marxism has little to say about societies and economies like those in Africa: the introduction of systems supposedly based upon it spells incompetence and oppression'. The West with its more flexible and pragmatic attitudes was better equipped to provide a response to Africa's problems, even though its institutions and bicameral Parliaments were 'not necessarily suitable for compulsory imitation'.

Zimbabwe

Turning to Zimbabwe, Lord Soames observed that for years African frustration and resentment had been fuelled by the continued hold on power of the tiny white minority in Rhodesia, and Britain, despite its explanations and efforts, had been held responsible. When Britain called the conference in Lancaster House (see pp 262-3, 364-70, 1979) and negotiated independence and majority rule, a sigh of relief went up that justice had at long last been done. Britain had stood by the Africans and had behaved honourably. The obstacle to good relations had been removed and the confidence that Britain had displayed in the Africans of Zimbabwe had been repaid: 'Before independence many people were convinced that a Patriotic Front Government would mean the introduction of a Communist society. Many white Rhodesians were convinced that defeat and majority rule would mean the end not just of their political privileges, but of their fundamental rights like that to private property. These fears have not been realised.' Noting that many whites were choosing to leave, Lord Soames said that this was not necessarily disastrous, since some had been there just to profit from the special conditions created by the unilateral declaration of independence, and fewer were leaving than many of the prophets of doom had foretold. The Zimbabwe Prime Minister, Mr Robert Mugabe, was doing all he could to ensure that there was a place in his country for all those prepared to contribute to its prosperity. His attempts to build a prosperous and multi-racial state deserved support (see pp 155, 288 and 358, 1980).

Political Challenge

Lord Soames emphasised the need for the West to rise to the occasion in Zimbabwe and elsewhere in Africa. A policy of sustained involvement was required to reinforce existing ties. Africa needed the West, and it was in the latter's interest that an adequate response was made.

The end of the colonial era, Lord Soames continued, gave the West 'freedom to speak to Africans on the basis of equality and mutual trust'. Although African leaders were often keen to play a constructive role in international affairs, their resources were inevitably limited and they would welcome 'sustained political dialogue with the principal countries of the West'. Britain and France had a unique role to play in maintaining political links with Africa and ensuring that the Western point of view was known and understood. Such dialogue would be all the more harmonious now that Nigeria, the most populous country in black Africa, had returned to democratic civilian rule. The Nigerian example showed how wrong it was to assume that Western values were somehow not viable in Africa.

The political dialogue could also create 'an

atmosphere of confidence in which the West [could] make a more tangible contribution to African stability and peace'. It was because Zimbabwe, for instance, had confidence in Britain that British military training teams were still engaged in forging a new Zimbabwean army. In addition to bilateral contacts, more formal arrangements had a role to play. The Lomé Convention (see p 322, 1979), for example, provided a tangible institutional link between Europe and former African colonies, and it was gratifying that Zimbabwe had so promptly applied for membership. [On 3 March Zimbabwe deposited in Brussels the instrument of ratification of the agreement – signed in November 1980 – concerning its accession to the second Lomé Convention.]

Economic Challenge

The West also needed to show that it was seriously concerned with the problems of Africa's economic development. It was a mistake to see economic development purely in terms of aid, for the financial expertise of the West could also make a major contribution. Nevertheless, aid on concessional terms was important, particularly in the very poorest African countries where industrial and agricultural development were not possible without it; neither were better housing, communications and the elimination of starvation and disease. Lord Soames said that the Soviet Union had a very sorry record on aid, and in 1978 Western European aid to Africa had amounted to more than the Soviet Union had ever given.

Africa also required help with cultural and educational infrastructure; the work of the British Council (see p 41), seconded personnel, missionaries, the British Broadcasting Corporation, and technical assistance all made 'an important contribution to the development of the cultural and intellectual life of African countries without which their full development [would] never be possible'.

Emphasising the importance to Africa of private investment from the West, Lord Soames said that ways of recycling the surpluses of oil-rich countries had to be devised to ensure that the developing countries received the assistance they needed. The members of the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries had to do more 'to help the really poor countries of Africa who [were], after all, among the countries that [suffered] most from rises in the price of oil'.

Trade, too, was a vital element in economic development. The markets of the West had to remain open to African products, and moves towards protectionism that would stifle the creation of wealth had to be resisted.

Southern Africa

Another issue which inevitably loomed large in the relationship between the West and Africa was posed 'by the continuation of the system of apartheid in South Africa'. Lord Soames hoped that most Africans realised that apartheid was repugnant to all the principles the West stood for: 'Any doubters should have been convinced by the tenacity with which [Britain] pursued a settlement in Zimbabwe based on genuine majority rule.' Nevertheless, if the West were to be a friend of Africa it had to show that it shared Africa's concern.

In particular, it had to persuade the South Africans that internationally recognised independence was the best outcome for Namibia (see pp 39-40): 'We must seek to convince them that if the South West Africa People's Organisation has majority support then it is dangerous to keep it at bayonet's length. We must point out that the Communist interference they so much fear is encouraged by the present situation and that an independent Namibia would offer the Soviet Union much less scope for interference and for extending its influence.' It was also necessary to explain to the Africans that measures designed to increase South Africa's isolation would 'do nothing to advance the cause of independence in Namibia, or majority rule in South Africa'. South Africa was well equipped to withstand an economic siege, and the damage done to the world economy from the imposition of economic sanctions would infinitely outweigh any theoretical political advantage. The West did not disagree with the aims of the Africans, but with some of the methods that were sometimes proposed.

In conclusion, Lord Soames said that the Western powers that had such close historical links with Africa were the only outsiders capable of making a genuine contribution. Africa offered enormous opportunities for fruitful and collaborative partnership, and Western civilisation could meet the threat from Communism in that continent on equal terms and emerge victorious.

Britain's Nuclear Deterrent

The Government's decision to maintain a strategic nuclear deterrent and its choice of the Trident missile system as the successor to the Polaris force, was endorsed by the House of Commons by 316 to 248 votes in March.

The decision to purchase the Trident missile system from the United States was announced in July 1980 (see pp 233-4, 1980). It is a submarine-launched ballistic missile, like Polaris, and is designed to carry up to eight independently targetable warheads. Its maximum range is between 4,000 and 6,000 nautical miles depending on the number of warheads carried. The new force will comprise four or five submarines, designed by and built in Britain, each of which will have 16 missiles.

Deterrence

Opening the debate (*Hansard*, Vol 1,000, No 59, cols 137-219), the Secretary of State for Defence, Mr John Nott, said that the issue before the House was the gravest which faced any Government, namely 'the issue of peace and how we can best maintain it'. The lunacy of war had been hugely increased by the existence of nuclear weapons, weapons which he viewed with total horror. They had given rise, in ethical terms, to

difficult if not agonising issues, but he believed that there was wide support for the view that the concept of nuclear deterrence was morally tenable so long as there was no better and surer way of avoiding the horrors of war. It was not a new policy, he added, but one that had succeeded over the last 25 years.

It was the responsibility of all Western Governments to avoid an East-West war, conventional as well as nuclear, but, in doing so, they had 'to deal with the leaders of a closed totalitarian state of hostile ideology, huge military power and a proven willingness to use that power without scruple when it thinks it can safely get away with it'. Such leaders were capable of using – and, in Mr Nott's view, would use – nuclear weapons as a source of blackmail were they given the chance. In view of these hard realities, the North Atlantic Alliance could offer no security without nuclear weapons, the possession of which, precisely because they were terrible, was absolutely cardinal to deterrence. Deterrence involved providing the capability to exact unacceptable destruction, so that anyone thinking of attacking the West was bound to calculate that the risks outweighed any possible gain. For the Alliance to renounce nuclear weapons, or to renounce a deterrent strategy in which they played a part, would be the ultimate foolishness: and for a country as central to the Alliance as Britain to attempt to wash its hands of nuclear affairs while remaining in and protected by the Alliance would be a dishonest and dangerous pretence.

While Mr Nott understood and sympathised with the widespread concern about nuclear war, he strongly believed that such apprehensions were misplaced provided that the policy of deterrence – which had kept the peace for half a lifetime in circumstances which in any other age would have probably led to war – was maintained. At the same time, he recognised that more could be done to make the nuclear balance more stable through arms control, but this required genuine will and the right conditions on both sides. The West would not achieve any good or true bargains by giving up or neglecting its strength while the Soviet Union kept and enhanced its own. Unilateral disarmament was the enemy, not the friend, of arms control. (The furtherance of arms control and disarmament, Mr Nott said later in answer to questions, remained at the very top of the Government's priorities, but the Government could not negotiate from weakness. There was no intention of matching the Warsaw Pact weapon for weapon, but only on the basis of rough equality – the capability to inflict unacceptable damage on the other side – would the West be able to bring the Soviet Union to the negotiating table.)

The Contribution to the Atlantic Alliance

The significance of Britain's nuclear contribution to the North Atlantic Alliance, Mr Nott explained, did not lie in its size, formidable though this was, but in the insurance it provided for peace – insurance, above all, against Soviet miscalculation. The United States could not have done more to demonstrate its engagement to Europe, but the 'British possession of nuclear striking power, Alliance committed yet independently controlled, [was] an insurance premium against any Soviet supposition that the United States might somehow seek to insulate itself from nuclear consequences whilst abandoning Europe'. Britain's capability would compel a would-be aggressor to face not one gamble but two, and two dissimilar ones at the same time. This second centre of decision-making was a real reinforcement of Alliance strength and one which, for various reasons, Britain alone was in a position to undertake. It was also by far the least costly of Britain's four major contributions to the Alliance [the other three being the contributions to the Central Region of Europe, the Eastern Atlantic and Channel areas, and the British Home Base and its immediate approaches], and its Allies, notably the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy, had made it clear in private and in public that they valued its continuance.

Strategic Capability

The core of Britain's nuclear capability, underpinning all the other elements and vital to their deterrent credibility, was the strategic force – the force which could plainly ride out any attack, even a pre-emptive attack, without warning, and still strike the Soviet Union a heavy enough blow to rob any aggression of its advantage. This capability was now provided by the Polaris submarine force, which, on completion of the Chevaline improvement programme (see p 97, 1980), would retain the ability to penetrate likely Soviet anti-ballistic missile defences into the early 1990s. For a variety of reasons, however, including the ageing 1960s technology of the submarines and the missiles, the increasing cost of refits in both money and time, and the steady Soviet advance in anti-submarine warfare, it would be a risk to rely on this force beyond that time.

Trident

In considering the replacement for Polaris, the Government had concluded that the most cost-effective course would be to purchase the Trident ballistic missile system. Three aspects of this choice, Mr Nott explained, had been of key importance. Firstly, the missile platform had to be invulnerable, to provide protection against a pre-emptive strike and to avoid having to make 'hair-trigger' decisions in a crisis. Both these considerations would be met by continuing with a submarine system. Secondly, the ballistic missile was chosen in preference to the cruise missile as the delivery system because it was both surer, in that it was less sensitive to uncertain assumptions about future Soviet defences, and because it had a much longer range and therefore far more sea-room in which to hide; and cheaper, because cruise missiles with their single warhead would require considerably more submarines – the most expensive part of the total system – for a given strike capability. There would also have been considerably higher capital costs, much higher running costs, less invulnerability and less assurance of penetration if submarine-launched cruise missiles had been chosen. Finally, in choosing

Trident in favour of reproducing Polaris in new submarines, the main consideration had been its anticipated longer life in service and recognition of the advantages, in cost as well as in capability, of operating the same system as the United States. Trident, Mr Nott continued, was a proven system of great power, and the case for it as the most cost-effective way of enabling Britain to maintain a strategic nuclear deterrent was overwhelming.

Turning to Trident's actual cost, Mr Nott said he was determined to keep as close as was sensibly possible to the original assessment – £4,500 million to £5,000 million which, over the 15 years' span of this investment, was likely to average some 3 per cent of total defence expenditure and perhaps 5 per cent at its peak. (In answer to questions, Mr Nott also pointed out that over the same period Trident would account for about 5 to 6 per cent of total equipment spending, and about 10 per cent of it in the peak years. The latter would also represent about 15 per cent of new equipment spending, a lower figure than the Tornado programme at its peak.) These were substantial figures, but neither unprecedented nor unmanageable. The real question was whether it was worthwhile to keep a strategic nuclear force which would cost £5,000 million out of total equipment spending over 15 years of £80,000 million to £90,000 million. In Mr Nott's judgment, the answer was yes. There were resource pressures, he admitted, which might compel some hard decisions on adjustments to present programmes, but Trident did not create these pressures; they existed already. The abandonment of the strategic nuclear deterrent would not remove these pressures, but it would certainly remove a central feature of Britain's postwar deterrent capability. He did not believe that this should be done on the grounds of cost.

Opposition Views

Mr Brynmor John, speaking for the Official Opposition, opposed the purchase of Trident on both defence and economic grounds. He thought that the idea that a Soviet attack on Britain could be so serious as to warrant a strategic nuclear response but not serious enough to involve the United States in coming to Britain's aid 'both preposterous and incredible'. It suggested that the United States and the North Atlantic Alliance could not be relied upon, and he did not accept this. As for the deterrent value of the uncertainty caused by a second decision centre, he thought that the logic of this led inexorably to the argument for nuclear proliferation. On economic grounds, he did not think that the country could afford an independent strategic deterrent of a new generation, especially when the whole economy was under great stress and many other services were being axed. The Trident programme would also distort the rest of the defence effort since it would cause the cancellation or deferment of other equipment and material.

Shorter Note

IRAN

The three British missionaries detained in Iran since August 1980 were released in late February (see pp 38-9). The Iranian authorities, however, are continuing to hold the British businessman, Mr Andrew Pyke, also detained since August. In a parliamentary reply on 4 March (*Hansard*, Vol 1,000, No 60, written answers, col 132), the Minister of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Mr Douglas Hurd, said that the continuing uncertainties over Mr Pyke's position made it difficult for Britain to resume normal relations with Iran.

ECONOMIC AND SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

The Budget 1981-82: a Summary

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Geoffrey Howe, in his Budget of 10 March, expressed determination to continue the firm action that was necessary to maintain Britain's success in the battle against inflation. He rejected the alternative of a change of economic course on the grounds that this 'would be fatal to the whole counter-inflation strategy' and would inflict on Britain 'a further dose of crippling inflation'. Among other measures, Sir Geoffrey announced a reduction in minimum lending rate from 14 per cent to 12 per cent.

The main proposals are summarised below. A fuller account together with a summary of the White Paper on public expenditure, issued the same day, will appear in the April edition of *Survey of Current Affairs*.

Increases in Revenue

Taxes and Duties

No change in rates of income tax. Personal allowances not to be raised in line with the rate of inflation.

A new oil tax, supplementary petroleum duty, of 20 per cent of North Sea oil and gas revenues, less an allowance (see p 363, 1980).

A special tax, for one year only, of 2·5 per cent of non-interest-bearing sterling bank deposits in excess of £10 million.

Increases in duty on alcoholic drinks leading to price increases (including value added tax) of about 4p on a pint of beer, 12p on a bottle of table wine, 25p on a bottle of sherry and 60p on a bottle of spirits.

Increases in tobacco duty which (including value added tax) will represent a rise of 14p in the price of a packet of 20 cigarettes.

Increases in duty on petrol and derv leading to a rise in price (including value added tax) of 20p a gallon.

Increases in vehicle excise duty of about 15 per cent, raising the annual duty on cars from £60 to £70.

The extension of car tax to motor cycles, scooters and mopeds.

Scales for taxation of company cars to be raised by a further 20 per cent in April 1982, on top of the 20 per cent increase for April 1981 announced in last year's Budget (see p 117, 1980).

Other Sources

A reduction from 60 years to 50 in the eligible age for holders of index-linked National Savings Certificates.

The introduction of a non-marketable savings certificate with a fixed capital value but with a return linked to the value of the British National Oil Corporation's North Sea oil.

An index-linked government security to be made available to certain institutional holders.

Aid to Industry

Relief for industry in its energy costs by raising the external financing limits for the electricity and gas industries.

Changes in development land tax to aid the construction industry.

Small businesses to be helped by a raising of the registration threshold for value added tax from £13,500 to £15,000 and a deferral of their liability to the full rate of corporation tax.

The introduction of a Business Start-up Scheme which will enable investors to obtain relief from income tax on up to £10,000 invested in any one year.

The establishment of a pilot loan guarantee scheme, to run for three years initially, for term loans of up to £75,000 for periods of between two and seven years. Government guarantees to be available for 80 per cent of each loan.

Financial Strategy

Adherence to the aim of a reduction in the annual rate of monetary growth to 4-8 per cent by 1983-84 (see p 113, 1980).

Target range of 6-10 per cent for the annual rate of growth of sterling M3 (money in circulation and British residents' sterling bank deposits) over the period February 1981 to April 1982.

Planned public sector borrowing requirement for 1981-82 of some £10,500 million.

Employment and Training Bill

The Employment and Training Bill, which was given a second reading in the House of Commons on 9 February, proposes amendments in the law relating to industrial training boards.

Provisions of the Bill

The Bill would empower the Secretary of State for Employment to establish, abolish or change the scope of an industrial training board (ITB)[1] – except for the Agricultural Training Board – without a recommendation from the Manpower Services Commission but subject to consultation with the Commission and others. The levy which a board is able to impose on employers within its industry could in future be used to meet any of its expenses (including administrative and operating expenses, which are at present met by the Government). The Bill proposes changes to the administration of the levy, including the exemption of an employer from liability to pay the levy, or to provide information, in respect of an establishment in an enterprise zone (see p 278, 1980).

Other clauses in the Bill propose amendments in the administration of ITBs, including the removal of ministerial control over the appointment and the terms and conditions of staff of an ITB and of the chairman of a committee of a board to which functions are delegated. The Bill also provides for the abolition of the Employment Service Agency and the Training Services Agency.

House of Commons Debate

The Bill was given a second reading by 299 votes to 248, a Government majority of 51. Introducing the debate (*Hansard*, Vol 998, No 43, cols 614-94) the Secretary of State for Employment, Mr James Prior, saw the Bill as an enabling measure. 'The Bill', he said, 'does not prescribe this or that particular reform. Its purpose instead is to enable reforms to be made in the operation and structure of ITBs.' It was preparing the ground for changes following the review by the Manpower Services Commission, due to finish in the summer.

Viewing the Bill within the context of the Government's overall policy, Mr Prior said 'I do not believe . . . that there is any serious disagreement . . . that our training system needs to be made more effective'. This was despite the fact that 'over the past 10 or 15 years vast sums of money have been spent on training, both by Government and by industry'. What counted was how effective the spending had been and it was the consideration of getting a much better return on money spent which would be the underlying principle of the Government's approach. One other key consideration which should determine the approach to training was the pace of economic and technological change. Far from slowing down, change was crowding in faster than ever before. A new industrial revolution was under way. Moreover, whereas very few people realised the import of the Industrial Revolution when it was taking place, there was now a much greater awareness of the significance of the changes taking place. 'Training and retraining', Mr Prior said, 'are areas where it is absolutely vital to introduce a much greater sense of flexibility and responsiveness. There will be new demands, new pressures and new opportunities. Our duty, therefore, must be to devise a system which can adapt and respond to them, and which can thus enable us not only to keep up with the pace of change, but also to make the most of the opportunities which lie ahead.' The Bill was one element in the Government's overall policy on training, and it should be viewed as an essential part in a package of measures designed to establish an effective and systematic approach. The objective was to change industrial training so that it better met the needs of industry by providing a solid foundation training for all and by reducing restrictions on the provision and use of trained workers, both young people and adults. The Government intended to publish its proposals for a new training initiative shortly.

Mr Prior outlined the key components which would shape the Government's new training initiative. The Government was committed, as resources permitted, to work towards the point where every school leaver would undertake a programme of vocational preparation. In some traditional craft apprenticeships there was a need to remove age restrictions and to place much greater weight on the attainment of recognised standards of performance. Training for skill needed to be seen in broader terms than just craft apprenticeships; systematic and flexible training needed to be developed for a wide range of other occupations at both higher and lower levels of skill, such as the computer field. The pace of change in the structure of employment and skills required by new technology meant that many workers would need to be retrained, not only once but perhaps two or three times in their working lives. The Government was urgently studying ways of improving links between training and education. On individual measures within the Bill, Mr Prior said that it was right that decisions about the future pattern of ITBs should rest with him, as the Minister accountable to Parliament, rather than with the Manpower Services Commission. The provision allowing for operating expenses of boards to be met in future out of the levy on employers rather than by the Government was desirable because the present system had led to an increase in bureaucracy and inefficiency. The present maximum levy of 1 per cent (of wages and salaries) which could be raised from employers without specific approval from Parliament would continue.

Opposition View

Mr Harold Walker, an Opposition spokesman on employment, said that the Government had adduced no arguments or evidence to justify the 'wholesale abolition of statutory industrial training boards'. He doubted whether a voluntary system would work. The right approach, he said, was not to cast aside the present arrangements, but to build on them.

[1]The 24 ITBs, covering about 60 per cent of employees, are responsible for promoting training in the industry which each covers.

Atomic Energy (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill

The Atomic Energy (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill, which enables the Government to dispose of shares in The Radiochemical Centre Ltd (TRC), received its second reading in the House of Commons on 10 February.

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE

Government View

Opening the debate (*Hansard*, Vol 998, No 44, cols 745-50), Mr Norman Lamont, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Energy, said that the Bill clarified the present powers of the Government to dispose of shares held in companies operating in the field of atomic energy in general and the present position of the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority (UKAEA) to dispose of shares in any company. In particular, it would enable the sale of up to 100 per cent of the shares in TRC, which produced radioactive isotopes for industry, medicine and research. Mr Lamont described the TRC as 'a world leader in its field' and said that about 80 per cent of its sales revenue came from overseas, 'an astonishing achievement'. In research radiochemicals it had won about 80 per cent of the British market, 30 per cent of the United States market and 30 per cent of the Japanese market. This had been achieved by 'a dynamic management and dedicated workforce in the face of tough, international competition'.

Mr Lamont said that the proposal to introduce private capital into the company was not a new idea. When TRC had been constituted as a limited company under the Atomic Energy Authority Act 1971 (see pp 37-8, 1971), with all its shares held on behalf of the Government by the UKAEA, the then Government had stated that it favoured eventual private participation. The present proposal to sell shares in TRC was 'in accordance with the Government's policy of introducing private capital into public sector companies and . . . coupled with TRC's outstanding record as a successful commercial operation', the company was 'plainly an excellent candidate for privatisation'. Its only link with the public sector was that its shares were held by the UKAEA and this was now 'an anachronism'. The reasons for privatisation were twofold, Mr Lamont continued: 'to reduce public involvement in a company which will benefit from full commercial freedom, and to lower the Government's need to borrow money'.

Mr Lamont said that when TRC had been set up it had been envisaged that a minority shareholding would be sold and, accordingly, the 1971 Act had provided for a majority of the voting shares in the company to be retained in the public sector. However, the Government now wished to have the option of selling more than half the shares and so the Bill removed the provision in the Act which required that the Secretary of State for Energy and the UKAEA between them should hold at least 50 per cent of the voting shares. The opportunity was also being taken to clarify the present position of the other two companies in which the UKAEA held shares: British Nuclear Fuels Ltd (BNFL, responsible for nuclear fuel services) and the National Nuclear Corporation (NNC – the overall contractor for nuclear power reactors and station design and construction in Britain).[1] The Bill ensured that the Secretary of State had the power to sell any shares that he owned in companies operating in atomic energy and that the UKAEA had the power to sell shares in any company that it owned, subject to the restriction in the 1971 Act on the sale of more than half the voting shares in BNFL which would be continued. Mr Lamont emphasised that the Government had at present no plans for the sale of shares in BNFL or the NNC.

Opposition View

An Opposition spokesman, Mr Edward Rowlands, noted that TRC had made 'a great deal of money', had 'invested very well' and was 'capable of making even more money as a 100 per cent government-owned company or as a government-controlled company'. There was no evidence that the structure of the company or the way it had been managed or owned had inhibited its growth and development. Mr Rowlands said that the Opposition was 'opposed most bitterly to the idea of the majority, if not the whole, of the company being sold'.

Steel Industry

A coherent framework for the Government's future policy towards the steel industry as a whole in Britain – both the British Steel Corporation (BSC) and the private sector – was outlined in a statement by the Secretary of State for Industry, Sir Keith Joseph, on 24 February. This will involve: reduction, and in due course elimination, of the element of subsidy in the Government's financing of BSC; the writing off of capital in BSC's accounts that reflected unused fixed assets and revenue losses in past years; amendment of the Iron and Steel Act 1975 (see p 7, 1976) through a new Bill to enable BSC to withdraw entirely from some areas of iron and steel production, either by transferring assets and businesses to the private sector, or by closing down plants that cannot be made profitable; and further re-structuring of the industry, in order to eliminate remaining surplus capacity. Sir Keith announced approval of the BSC's corporate plan, under which it aims to break even in 1982-83, and the Government's agreement to provide short-term funds to implement it.

SECRETARY OF STATE'S STATEMENT

In his statement (*Hansard*, Vol 999, No 54, cols 745-7), Sir Keith drew attention to the factors

[1]For information on the activities of these companies see COI reference pamphlet *Nuclear Energy in Britain*, No 41/RP/80.

that had contributed to the current state of affairs in the industry. These included: unrealistic investment programmes; surplus capacity; a weak market; and the high value of sterling. During 1980, manned steelmaking capacity had been cut from 21·5 million to 15 million tonnes of liquid steel a year, 50,000 jobs (nearly a third of the workforce) had been cut, and works closed and manning levels slimmed to raise productivity.

Sir Keith said that the aim was for BSC to become internationally competitive. The new chairman, Mr Ian MacGregor, had reorganised the Corporation into separate businesses, each responsible for the production and marketing of a specific product range. His corporate plan for BSC envisaged a manned capacity of 14·4 million tonnes of liquid steel a year, but he was committed, if the assumptions behind the plan were not sustained, to reduce the Corporation to a size that could in fact make a profit. BSC's results would depend not only on its own performance but also on factors such as exchange rates, the European market and any upturn in steel ordering in Britain. Sir Keith thought the chairman was right in admitting that his plan was optimistic; but Mr MacGregor had made it clear to the Government and to the managers and workforce of BSC that there would be no future for any operations that were not competitive.

Financial Provisions

In view of BSC's continuing need of external finance, both to offset substantial but reduced losses and also provide for heavy redundancy and closure costs and a limited programme of essential capital expenditure, its external financing limit (EFL) for 1980-81 has been set at £1,121 million (an increase of £150 million) and its EFL for 1981-82 at £730 million, as requested in the BSC's corporate plan. Sir Keith said that the Government was prepared to approve the plan and to provide the finance needed to implement it on condition that BSC behaved responsibly towards private sector firms.

Sir Keith said that, because BSC was a statutory body, it could not be liquidated like a private sector company and the Government and taxpayers could not at present escape from funding it. The Government was therefore seeking powers to relieve taxpayers of the obligation to fund BSC indefinitely. The Corporation's target was to reduce its loss before interest from an estimated £480 million in 1980-81 to £225 million in 1981-82 and to achieve break-even in 1982-83. Sir Keith emphasised that, if the chairman's optimism was not justified, further plant closures and redundancies might be necessary. The Government would monitor progress closely in each of BSC's businesses, and the chairman would give his assessment of progress by July 1981.

Impact of BSC on the Private Sector

As the Government was greatly concerned about the impact of the European steel recession – together with BSC's vigorous marketing – on private sector firms, Sir Keith had authorised BSC to negotiate viable joint private companies with those firms whose operations overlapped with its own. (Agreement with the GKN group on one such company, to be called Allied Steel and Wire, was announced on 20 February, while transitional arrangements for some of the assets of Duport Steel were announced on 23 February.) Sir Keith stressed that BSC had to compete fairly with private firms. The chairman had undertaken personally to investigate any specific allegations of unfair pricing that were put to him by companies or members of Parliament; the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Industry, Mr Michael Marshall, would monitor these complaints and report to Sir Keith. Moreover, in order to make BSC's operations more 'transparent' and to pave the way for further privatisation, Mr MacGregor had agreed to consider placing those BSC businesses which were in competition with the private sector in separate companies under the Companies Acts. Sir Keith said that the Government intended the competition the private sector faced from BSC to be fair and expected more joint companies to be created which would be in the private sector.

Assisted Areas

Sir Keith said that the plans involved job losses in areas where unemployment was above the national average but which were already assisted areas (see p 267, 1979), so considerable support was already available to encourage new investment and to help the jobless to find work. The Government did not intend to alter the assisted area status of any steel closure area at this time, though it did not underestimate the problems for the communities and people concerned. Sir Keith would, if necessary, consider whether any regrading of the areas affected would be appropriate.

European Community

Sir Keith said that the Government would also seek to ensure that market conditions in Europe were improved. The production quotas imposed under the Treaty of Paris would expire on 30 June 1981 and the Government was already discussing the measures to replace them with Britain's Community partners. It intended to ensure that reductions in capacity were equitably shared among the member countries of the Community and that, so far as possible, short-term market conditions did not invalidate long-term commercial objectives. The proposed financial provision would require approval from the European Commission.

IRON AND STEEL BILL

The Iron and Steel Bill 1981, which was published on 24 February, makes provision for the legislative changes necessary to implement the Government's decisions. Its two main purposes are to remove from BSC the general duty to supply iron and steel products (thus enabling it to withdraw entirely from some areas of production and ease the transfer of businesses to the private sector) (clause 1), and to effect a capital reconstruction of the Corporation (clauses 2, 3 and 4). The Bill proposes to reduce BSC's capital by writing off its remaining losses of £509 million from the National Loans Fund and writing off £3,000

million from its capital. This total write-off of £3,509 million reflects the loss of value of the capital as evidenced by the write-down of fixed assets and revenue losses in recent years. Up to another £1,000 million would be written off by Order in the House of Commons; this would be necessary only if BSC profit expectations were not realised. The Bill also provides for a reduction in BSC's borrowing limit from £6,000 million to £3,500 million following the write-off. Sir Keith pointed out that this did not represent the commitment of additional funds to BSC; rather, it marked 'the huge cost to the taxpayer of over-ambitious, centrally directed investments and the uncompetitive use of many of them'.

Shorter Notes

INDUSTRY BILL AMENDMENTS

Financial amendments to the Industry Bill (see p 18) were introduced by the Government on 4 February (*Hansard*, Vol 998, No 40, cols 312-14). The proposed financial limits of the National Enterprise Board (NEB) were reduced from £2,251 million to £750 million. The reduction of £1,501 million comprises a token £1 million increase in the amount for BL Ltd which had been proposed in the Bill, and £1,500 million which had already been set aside for the company. The reduction is made because the Government intends to transfer the public shareholding in BL from the NEB to the Secretary of State for Industry on 31 March. Accordingly, the financial limits for the Secretary of State are raised to £4,400 million, with provision to increase the amount by Order in the House of Commons to £5,250 million. The sum of £4,400 million comprises £2,900 million for BL (which can be increased by Order to £3,250 million) and £1,500 million for Rolls-Royce (which can be increased by Order to £2,000 million). The limits cover the companies' external financing from private sources as well as public investment, for the next five years. Details of public investment in BL were announced on 26 January (see p 49).

SMALL FIRMS' INCORPORATION

A new form of incorporation for small family firms, aimed at removing some of the burdens placed on them by incorporation under existing company law, is discussed in a Government Green Paper published on 19 February.[1] The Government's policy is to create an environment in which small businesses may be sustained or expanded and new small firms more easily started, the paper says. It is therefore desirable to eliminate any unnecessary formalities. At present where there is more than one proprietor, the choice of method of operation for the small firm lies between the partnership, with full liability for debts and obligations shared among the partners, and the registered private company with limited liability. Partnerships can be formed without legal formality, says the paper, whereas companies are legal entities independent of their members. Among the requirements placed on companies are that they must maintain and disclose information on their activities and must obey rules governing their internal organisation (such as distinguishing between the functions of members and directors, holding annual general meetings, and passing resolutions formally). 'For small family businesses', says the Report, 'these requirements might seem superfluous either because of the close relationship between the members, or because the limited liability for which disclosure is required is circumscribed in practice as creditors obtain personal guarantees from the directors.' The paper therefore discusses new forms of incorporation for small businesses, concentrating on the issues raised by a memorandum (reproduced in the paper) drawn up by the Department of Trade's research adviser on company law, Professor L. C. B. Gower. This in effect proposes 'an incorporated partnership with legal personality, the members of which might enjoy a measure of limited liability'. In particular, the paper raises the issues of how far liability might be limited, what the maximum number of members should be, what business activities would be included in the scheme, how the formation and the accounts and audits of the proposed form of businesses would be regulated, whether they would be free to raise money by way of floating charges and what powers of official investigation would be appropriate. Considerations of the minimum level of paid-up capital, of public administration, and of taxation, employment legislation and official schemes of aid are also raised. The paper discusses arrangements for small businesses in France and West Germany. A deadline date for the submission of comments to the Department of Trade is to be announced later in 1981.

[1] *A New Form of Incorporation for Small Firms.* Cmnd 8171. HMSO, £3·20. ISBN 0 10 181710 X.

INNER CITIES POLICY

The Secretary of State for the Environment, Mr Michael Heseltine, has restated the Government's approach to inner cities policy. In a statement to the House of Commons on 9 February (*Hansard*, Vol 998, No 43, cols 603-10), Mr Heseltine announced that the inner city partnership and programme authority arrangements (see p 309, 1979) would continue, although their procedures would be simplified and guidelines would be produced in consultation with local authorities to promote greater efficiency.

The private sector should be encouraged to play the fullest possible part, and effective consultation with local industry and commerce would therefore be a prior condition of providing urban programme grant. The voluntary sector could also contribute much and should also be consulted.

The list of authorities included in the schemes would remain unchanged, although the creation of

an Urban Development Corporation in the London docklands would mean the ending of existing partnership arrangements there.

Total provision for expenditure on inner city regeneration in England and Wales in 1981-82 would be some £224 million, of which £158 million would go to the urban programme and £66 million to the two Urban Development Corporations (in London and on Merseyside). The total represents an increase in expenditure.

The Government's aim, Mr Heseltine said, was to make inner cities 'places where people want to live and work, and where the private investor is prepared to put his money. The changes ... should ensure that we can mobilise resources as effectively as possible to tackle the problems.'

RAILWAY ELECTRIFICATION

A substantial programme of main line railway electrification would be financially worthwhile, according to a joint report by the Department of Transport and the British Railways Board, published on 11 February.[1] Announcing the publication of the report, the Secretary of State for Transport, Mr Norman Fowler, said in the House of Commons (*Hansard*, Vol 998, No 46, written answers, col 370) that in economic terms the report presented a favourable assessment. However, electrification would require substantial extra investment and he would have to consider carefully the prospects of the Board's commercial businesses and how the funds to finance electrification might be generated.

The review's main task was a comprehensive financial analysis of different programmes of main line electrification, which were compared with a basic option of continuing with a predominantly diesel-operated railway, but adding a few relatively small electrification projects in hand or currently planned. British Rail's existing electrified network comprises the London-Glasgow main line (including services to Birmingham, Liverpool and Manchester), much of the Southern Region (including nearly all its main and suburban passenger lines from London), and a number of other suburban services, primarily on the Eastern Region and around Glasgow.[1] The review worked on a number of main assumptions including the ability of the major commercial businesses of the railways (inter-city, freight and parcels services), by greater efficiency and adaptation to the market, to increase traffic at higher real fare levels and so improve financial results, and the achievement, in line with current experience, of higher efficiency and lower operating costs by electrification. All the larger electrification options examined showed an internal real rate of return of about 11 per cent and the report says that, 'if funds for railway financing were not constrained, the best course would be to choose now the largest and fastest programme'. This would be completed in 20 years and include electrification of the London–Edinburgh–Aberdeen, London–Sheffield, London–Bristol–Swansea, London–Plymouth–Penzance, Edinburgh–Glasgow, Liverpool–York and York–Birmingham–Bristol/Reading lines. As a result, over 80 per cent of passenger traffic and some 70 per cent of freight traffic would be electrically hauled, as against about 50 per cent and 20 per cent respectively under the basic option, and more than half of the route mileage would be electrified, compared with around one-fifth at present. In considering the wider effects of electrification, the review did not find any important disadvantage, but identified two important advantages: a small but useful contribution to reducing Britain's dependence on oil, and a high and reasonably stable demand for Britain's railway manufacturing industry which 'should produce lower unit costs of production and develop technology, and so assist the industry to compete for overseas electrification work more effectively'.

[1]*Review of Main Line Electrification: Final Report*. Department of Transport and British Railways Board. HMSO, £4·50. ISBN 0 11 550539 3.

[1]For a map of the railways, see COI fact sheet *Railways*, FSB/E9/79.

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Britain and the Year of Disabled People

Britain is supporting the United Nations International Year for Disabled People, and was a co-sponsor of the motion calling for a year to focus attention on disabled people. The year is being marked in Britain by events organised throughout the country by voluntary bodies and government departments. As part of its contribution the Government has made legislative proposals for a new framework of special education for handicapped children (see p 79).

The United Nations has declared 1981 the International Year for Disabled People, with the theme of 'full participation and equality'. The title has been changed in Britain to the International Year of Disabled People to reflect the fact that the events are being arranged mainly by the disabled[1] through their organisations and are therefore 'of' and not 'for' them. Britain is represented on the advisory committee for the Year.

Objectives of the Year

In proclaiming the Year the United Nations has five principal objectives: to help disabled people in their physical and psychological adjustment to society; to promote all national and international efforts to provide the disabled with proper assistance, training, care and guidance, to make available opportunities for suitable work and to ensure their full integration in society; to encourage study and research projects designed to facilitate the practical participation of disabled people in daily life; to educate and inform the public of the rights of disabled people to participate in and contribute to various aspects of economic, social and political life; and to promote effective measures for the prevention of disability and for the rehabilitation of the disabled.

Another objective is to further the implementation of the 1971 Declaration on the Rights of Mentally Retarded Persons and the 1975 Declaration on the Rights of Disabled Persons, both of which were adopted by the UN General Assembly.

[1]The term 'disabled people' includes those who are physically handicapped, deaf, hard of hearing, blind, partially sighted, speech impaired, mentally handicapped or mentally ill. It also includes people with handicaps such as epilepsy, psoriasis and disabilities linked to ageing.

Britain's Contribution

Britain's response is being co-ordinated by Voluntary Organisations Committees for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, with the Prince of Wales as patron. In addition, the English and Welsh committees have appointed presidents – the Earl of Snowdon and Mr George Thomas, Speaker of the House of Commons, respectively. All four committees have been given a grant towards administrative costs from government funds.

The committees' functions are to stimulate and co-ordinate voluntary activities and the dissemination of information; increase public awareness of the needs of disabled people and promote the discussion of related issues; encourage involvement in the Year by voluntary organisations; and initiate projects during the Year to promote its aims thereafter. The committees are not directly involved in activities, nor will they organise a fund or raise funds nationally. Fund raising is being organised by national and local groups and used for their own projects.

As part of the committees' campaign for greater awareness of the needs of disabled people, a guide to local authorities has been prepared which suggests ways of furthering the aims of the Year. These include: reviewing the provision of social services for which authorities are responsible, particularly in terms of the implementation of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970; considering authorities' policies towards employing disabled people; setting up local 'Access Groups' of disabled people to advise on planning needs; reviewing the access available to disabled people in all the facilities maintained by local authorities; and identifying the need for adaptation to houses occupied by disabled people.

Among a wide range of activities designed by voluntary organisations throughout Britain to publicise the need to prevent disability and remove physical and social barriers against the disabled are a number of long-term projects. A national appeal is to be made to finance the building of an extension to laboratories in south-east London which undertake research into Parkinson's disease, while another plan is to provide four bungalows and 50 electric cars for disabled adults and two intensive care incubators for new-born babies. A competition is to be held to find the best design for a garden that can be maintained by a person in a wheelchair, and a disability

advisory service is to be set up to help solve mobility problems. It is planned to buy a special building in Leicestershire to house a toy library for disabled children and in northern England an attempt is being made to raise £200,000 to add special facilities to a residential centre so that disabled young people can enjoy pot-holing, pony trekking and other outdoor pursuits.

Throughout the Year a variety of conferences and seminars on the needs of the disabled are taking place with such titles as 'Disability and Income Needs', 'The Care of the Severely Handicapped', 'Mental Handicap – what Future?', 'New Horizons for the Disabled', 'IYDP – The Role of Music Therapy' and 'The Disabled and the Community'. In addition, at the end of March, London is to be the location of the first International Conference on Human Value, with the Duke of Edinburgh as patron. Aspects of disability are among the topics to be discussed.

The National Film Theatre in London has shown a number of feature films about disabled people at which sign language interpreters were available for deaf people. Exhibitions include 'One in Ten', a display of photographs on the theme of disability, and 'Helping the Handicapped', an exhibition of well-designed aids for disabled people organised by the Design Council. A children's party is to be held in the grounds of Lambeth Palace, the London residence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and will be attended by the Archbishop. A number of sporting events are taking place in conjunction with the Sports Council's 'Sport for All – Disabled People' campaign. Examples include an indoor bowls competition for visually handicapped people, the International Paraplegic Games at Stoke Mandeville Stadium (the stadium – the first in the world to be designed for the disabled – is part of Stoke Mandeville Hospital which specialises in severe spinal injuries) and a wheelchair triathlon to be held at Stoneleigh, Warwickshire, under the auspices of the Sports Council.

Some organisations will be particularly active during designated 'weeks' or 'days', for example: World Health Day (the theme of which is 'Health For All By The Year 2000', National Cystic Fibrosis Week, National Schizophrenia Day, National Epilepsy Week, Arthritis Week, Eczema Week, Mental Handicap Week, Access Week, National Day for the Hard of Hearing, and Muscular Dystrophy Week.

Publicity for the Year is being given by the BBC and independent television and radio which are producing special programmes in addition to those already regularly broadcast for the disabled. The Post Office is marking the Year by issuing a set of four commemorative stamps.

Government Support

The Government has expressed its full support for the International Year of Disabled People, and Baroness Young, Minister of State in the Department of Education and Science, has referred to it as 'a highlight in a continuing process of increasing participation and integration of disabled people'. In a debate in the House of Lords on 14 January (*Hansard* (*HL*), Vol 46, No 17, cols 44-152), she outlined the activities planned by government departments but drew attention to the constraints imposed on public spending by the present economic situation.

Baroness Young referred to the Government's concern for social welfare and to the high level of expenditure on the personal social services, which include services for the disabled, and on the National Health Service in general. Figures showed an increase in the provision of day nurseries, of day centres, and in facilities for mentally handicapped children. She described the plans for the Year made by government departments, especially those most closely involved with the disabled. For example, the Department of Transport is proposing to reduce from 17 to 16 the age at which young disabled people in receipt of mobility allowance can apply for a provisional driving licence. The Department will also be holding a conference – Transport without Handicap – in London in March, designed to bring together leading representatives from the disablement and transport fields to look at ways in which transport can be made to meet the needs of disabled people. There is to be a national rally for disabled drivers in June. The Department of Employment and the Manpower Services Commission are continuing to promote the 'Fit for Work' campaign which encourages employers to give work to disabled people.

The Department of the Environment is sponsoring an award for good building design suited to the needs of disabled people and in the urban aid programme a special emphasis is being placed on projects to benefit the disabled. The Department's Property Services Agency has a programme to adapt at least one public building in each of 71 British towns to make them accessible to disabled people, and investigations are continuing to find suitable buildings for adaptation in other towns. The Department of Health and Social Security is funding the secretariat for the English Voluntary Organisations Committee and is taking account of the Year in making grants to voluntary bodies. A new edition of 'Help for Handicapped People', a guide to benefits and services, has been issued. The Government also intends to make a major contribution to the Year by reforming the framework within which special education is provided, and legislation has been introduced which will embody the changes set out in the White Paper *Special Needs in Education*.

[A fact sheet, *Britain and the International Year of Disabled People*, No 96/FSB/81, which is in preparation, outlines the services for disabled people in Britain and refers to Britain's contribution to the alleviation of disability overseas.]

Education of Handicapped Children

The Education Bill, which would make new provision for the education of handicapped children based on the concept of special

educational needs, has been given a second reading.

Provisions of the Bill

The Bill, which was given a second reading in the House of Commons on 2 February (*Hansard*, Vol 998, No 38, cols 27-102), makes legislative proposals for England and Wales in accordance with the White Paper *Special Needs in Education* (see p 281, 1980).

It introduces a new concept of special educational needs to replace the present system of education related to categories of disability. The Bill provides definitions of the terms 'special educational needs' and 'special educational provision'. A child would have 'special educational needs' if he had a learning difficulty which called for a special educational provision. Learning difficulty would be recognised where a child had a significantly greater difficulty in learning than the majority of children of a similar age; where a child suffered from a disability which either prevented or hindered him from making use of educational facilities generally provided in schools for children of a similar age; and where a child might correspond to either of these criteria once over the age of five. 'Special educational provision' is defined as any educational provision which is additional to, or different from, that made for children of the same age; it would also apply to any educational provision made for a child under the age of two.

The Bill would extend the duties of local education authorities and school governors to take account of the definitions of special educational needs and provisions. Authorities would be responsible for ensuring that as far as possible children who have special educational needs should be educated with those who have not. The Bill would also impose a duty on local education authorities to make children with more serious difficulties the subject of regular review which would involve making a formal 'statement' of their educational needs. Local authorities would be empowered, with the consent of parents, to assess the special educational need of, and to maintain statements for, children under the age of two. Under the Bill parents would be involved in the making of assessments and could appeal against decisions not to make special provision for their child. Parents would also be able to request that the needs of their children be assessed, whether or not statements were being maintained for them.

Secretary of State's Speech

Introducing the second reading of the Bill, the Secretary of State for Education and Science, Mr Mark Carlisle, said that a reform of the statutory framework of special educational provision was long overdue. Three major themes in the Warnock report had formed the basis for the proposals contained in the Bill. First, that it was time to correct the view that children may be divided conveniently into handicapped and non-handicapped, and that children could be classified rapidly according to a category of handicap. Secondly, that a disability or learning difficulty will vary in the extent to which it hinders a child's development. This would depend not only on the child's personal characteristics, such as intelligence, drive and social adjustment, but on the educational and other resources which are provided to overcome handicapping circumstances. Thirdly, that children and young people with special educational needs should be educated, as far as was reasonable and practicable, in association with those who did not have such needs.

Mr Carlisle said that the Government was introducing changes that would enhance the role of parents, ensure that children would be looked at as individuals, and would put an end to a system based on labels and the stigma of being classed as handicapped. In commending the Bill to the House he said that he could think of no better contribution to the International Year of Disabled People (see p 78).

Indecent Displays (Control) Bill

Measures to control the public display of indecent material in Great Britain are proposed in a Bill before Parliament. The Indecent Displays (Control) Bill, which has received an unopposed second reading in the House of Commons, is a private member's measure but its broad objectives have the support of the Government.

The principal legislation covering indecent display is contained in the Vagrancy Act 1824 and the Indecent Advertisements Act 1889; there is at present no general statute covering advertising and display. The new Bill would make the display of indecent material in public places a criminal offence. 'Public display' would include not only a display visible from the pavement but also a display in any place to which the public have, or are allowed to have, access. The Bill would cover, for example, cinema club posters, bookshop and sex shop displays. It would not cover, however, a public place or display to which people paid for admission, nor a shop or any part of a shop to which the public could gain access only by passing an adequate warning notice. Moreover, a person under 18 years of age would not be allowed to enter premises while such a display was in progress. The Bill would not include displays in art galleries or museums, television broadcasts, theatres or cinemas.

Introducing the Bill in the House of Commons on 30 January (*Hansard*, Vol 997, No 37, cols 1165-209), Mr Tim Sainsbury, Conservative MP for Hove, said that displays causing offence were becoming increasingly prevalent not only in London and other big cities, but throughout the country. The Bill was needed because a difference had long been recognised between people making a conscious choice to look at sex films, magazines or displays of so-called sex-aids, and people having such material thrust in front of them when they did not wish to see it.

Confirming the Government's support for the broad objectives of the Bill, the Minister of State

at the Home Office, Mr Patrick Mayhew, said that the Bill dealt with a matter which was a source of much public concern and with a part of the law which was in an antiquated and confusing form. He praised the Bill's balance and moderation and considered it performed a most valuable service in clarifying and modernising the existing law. At best it could have a salutary, and restrictive, effect on what many people saw as a considerable public nuisance. The Government would be prepared to give the Bill as much technical assistance as it could so as to achieve an objective with which most members of Parliament warmly sympathised.

Shorter Notes

RACE RELATIONS

The Home Secretary has announced that the activities of extremist groups alleged to be responsible for attacks on members of minority communities are to be investigated.

In a speech to the Indian Journalists' Association on 19 February the Home Secretary, Mr William Whitelaw, acknowledged that racialist attacks had been causing anxiety among members of minority communities and that it had been claimed that these attacks against individuals, their homes and places of worship were organised by extremists. He said he had agreed to follow up suggestions made by the Joint Committee against Racialism that the activities of extremist groups alleged to be responsible for such attacks should be studied and that consideration should be given to setting up, when necessary, special units in police forces to investigate alleged cases. Officials would visit areas which had suffered from the activities of these groups and would discuss the position with local authorities, community leaders and the police. Chief Constables and the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police in London were determined that the police should respond positively.

Mr Whitelaw said that the Government had given priority to law and order and had taken a number of steps to strengthen the police in the battle against crime. However, the police needed the support of the public and it was important that racialist and other attacks should be reported to them. He wished to emphasise that the job of protecting people, whatever their colour or race, was for the police.

HEALTH AND PERSONAL SERVICES

Care in Action, a handbook published by the Government on 25 February,[1] sets out the policies and priorities which should guide the new district health authorities (see pp 257-8, 1980), local government and the voluntary movement, and emphasises the importance of preventive services. The priorities include services for the elderly, the mentally handicapped, the mentally ill, and the physically and sensorily handicapped; other priority services are those for maternity care, neonatal care, primary care by family doctors, and services related to the care of young children at risk and to the care and treatment of juvenile offenders. The handbook also emphasises the responsibility of individuals for their own health, and the importance of the family, and of the whole network of support available within the community and through the voluntary services. It stresses the importance of a proper partnership between the public and private health sectors. Another theme is the need to improve efficiency and to secure the best value for money at a time of economic difficulty.

'OPEN CHANNEL' RADIO

The Government's decision to legalise the system of personal radio communication, to be known as 'Open Channel', was announced by the Home Secretary, Mr William Whitelaw, in the House of Commons on 26 February (*Hansard*, Vol 996, No 56, written answers, col 415). The new personal two-way radio service, which was the subject of a recent Government discussion document (see pp 281-2, 1980), will be authorised on 27 MHz FM (frequency modulated), and a further frequency around 930 MHz will also be made available. Equipment will be required to meet a technical specification and users will have to hold a licence, renewable annually, which will entitle them to use equipment on either frequency. The 27-MHz AM (amplitude modulated) equipment will remain illegal. It is hoped that the new service will be introduced in the autumn.

[1] *Care in Action – A Handbook of Policies and Priorities for the Health and Personal Social Services in England.* HMSO, £3·30. ISBN 0 11 320755 7.

DOCUMENTATION

Government and Administration

Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration Annual Report for 1980. HMSO, £3·60. ISBN 0 10 214881 3.

The Future of the Civil Service Department: Government Observations on the First Report from the Treasury and Civil Service Committee, Session 1980-81. Cmnd 8170. HMSO, £1·40. ISBN 0 10 181700 2.

Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Local Government in Scotland. The Committee, appointed by the Secretary of State for Scotland in December 1979, concludes that, in view of the uncertainty that exists about the respective roles of each tier in the present structure of local government, responsibility for each function, delegated or otherwise, should in future be specifically allocated and the particular powers and duties of each authority clearly defined. Cmnd 8115. HMSO, £4·90. ISBN 0 10 181150 0.

External Affairs and Defence

Right of Residence. Report by the House of Lords Select Committee on the European Communities concerning a proposal for a Community directive on the right of residence for nationals of member states in the territory of another member state. HMSO, £2·10. ISBN 0 10 405581 2.

Agreement on the Accession of the Republic of Zimbabwe to the Second ACP-EEC Convention signed at Lomé on 31 October 1979 with Final Act. Cmnd 8150. HMSO, £1·40. ISBN 0 10 181500 X.

Economic and Scientific Affairs

Inland Revenue. 123rd report of the Commissioners for the year ended 31 March 1980. Cmnd 8160. HMSO, £4·40. ISBN 0 10 181600 6.

Public Works Loan Board. 105th Annual Report, 1979-80. HMSO, £2·50. ISBN 0 11 630687 4.

Imports and Exports. First Report from the House of Commons Industry and Trade Committee, Session 1980-81. HMSO, £4·90. ISBN 0 10 274781 4.

A New Form of Incorporation for Small Firms (see p 76). Cmnd 8171. HMSO, £3·20. ISBN 0 10 181710 X.

The Government's Statement on the New Nuclear Power Programme. First Report from the House of Commons Select Committee on Energy, Session 1980-81.

Volume I: Report and Minutes of Proceedings. HMSO, £5·30. ISBN 0 10 276181 7.

Volume II: Minutes of Evidence (Part 1). HMSO, £14·70. ISBN 0 10 275681 3.

Volume III: Minutes of Evidence (Part 2). Appendices (Part 1). HMSO, £9·90. ISBN 0 10 275381 4.

Volume IV: Appendices (Part 2). HMSO, £8·70. ISBN 0 10 275481 0.

Nuclear Energy in Britain. COI, No 41/RP/80.

Review of Main Line Electrification: Final Report (see p 77). Department of Transport and British Railways Board. HMSO, £4·50. ISBN 0 11 550539 3.

Social and Cultural Affairs

Citizens Advice Bureaux. COI, No 89/FSB/81.

Civil Judicial Statistics Scotland 1979. Statistics relating to the business of civil courts, licensing boards and legal and public departments for the year 1979. Cmnd 8111. HMSO, £4·80. ISBN 0 10 181110 1.

Inquiry into the Value of Pensions. The report of an independent inquiry appointed by the Prime Minister in May 1980 to consider the value of index-linked pensions and job security. Cmnd 8147. HMSO, £3·90. ISBN 0 10 181470 4.

Care in Action – A Handbook of Policies and Priorities for the Health and Personal Social Services in England (see p 81). HMSO, £3·30. ISBN 0 11 320755 7.

The Future of Building Control in England and Wales. Cmnd 8179. HMSO, £2·10. ISBN 0 10 181790 8.

© *Crown Copyright 1981*

Printed in England by Brown Knight & Truscott Ltd
and Published by
HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
£1.20p net

Annual subscription including indices and postage £18.60

H2705 Dd 8202100 K8 MARCH/81 1980
ISBN 0 11 726 Vol. 11 No. 3
ISSN 0039—6214